

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Thus, claims 1-30 are pending.

SUPPORT FOR AMENDMENTS

Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs 0015, 0016, 0044, 0048, 0050 and 0054. No new matter has been added by way of amendment.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 19-24, 26, 27 and 29 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0259688 of Forte (*Forte*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 19-24, 26, 27 and 29 are not anticipated by *Forte*.

Claim 1 recites:

receiving an incoming telephone call at a private branch exchange, the telephone call directed to a telephone extension of the private branch exchange corresponding to a user;
determining a call routing preference associated with the extension; and
routing the telephone call based on a computing device location and the call routing preference, wherein routing the telephone call includes:
routing the telephone call to a telephone associated with the extension if the computing device associated with the user is in a first location, and
routing the telephone call to the computing device if the computing device is not in the first location.

Thus, Applicants claim routing a telephone call to a telephone or to a computing device based on the location of the computing device. Claims 11 and 21 similarly recite routing a telephone call to a telephone or to a computing device based on the location of the computing device.

Forte discloses routing calls to a wireless device corresponding to a user. See paragraph 0007. Calls are not routed based on the location of a computing device. Further, calls are not routed to the computing device under certain conditions. Therefore, *Forte* cannot anticipate the invention as claimed in claims 1, 11 and 21.

Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9 and 10 depend from claim 1. Claims 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 depend from claim 11. Claims 24, 26, 27 and 29 depend from claim 21. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 26, 27 and 29 are not anticipated by *Forte* for at least the reasons set forth above.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8, 18, 28 and 30 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Forte*. As discussed above, *Forte* does not disclose or suggest routing calls as recited in the claims. Therefore, *Forte* cannot suggest the invention as recited in claims 8, 18, 28 and 30.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: September 10, 2008

/Paul A. Mendonsa/

Paul A. Mendonsa
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778